

REMARKS

In the January 17, 2008 Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-23, 26, 35-38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen (6,339,437 B1; hereinafter “Nielsen”) in view of Jaeger (7,103,851 B1; hereinafter “Jaeger”). On March 17, 2008, the Applicant responded to the Examiner’s Final Office Action. The Examiner in turn rendered the Advisory Action to which the Applicant is replying.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner has maintained his rejection of claims 1 and 3-38 by noting that the term ‘relative importance’ may be read broadly. More specifically,

“The Examiner notes that nowhere in the claim recites that the relative importance of contents in the corresponding locations of the file is based on a comparison with other locations in the file. Thus, the relative importance of contents may be read broadly as to what the importance of contents is relative to.”
(Page 2, paragraph 1 of Advisory Action)

With all due respect, the Applicant believes that the Examiner has construed the term “relative importance” too broadly. In particular, the specification describes relative importance as comparing the importance of contents of one location to the importance of content of other locations in the file. See page 6, ll. 10-24 and page 9, ll. 1-12 of Application. In order to more clearly define this aspect of the invention, the Applicant has amended the claims to recite in part,

wherein the relative importance of contents in the corresponding locations of the file is based on comparing the importance of contents in locations of the file with one another

In contrast, Jaeger (discussed in more detail in previous communications) teaches the use of markers to denote the importance of the contents being marked (with tags) for a particular location only and does not teach or suggest the comparing of importance of locations in the file with other locations in the file. Therefore, Jaeger does not teach or suggest relative importance as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, the Applicant believes that claim 1 as amended is neither anticipated nor suggested by the cited references and therefore is allowable.

Independent claims 35-37 have been amended to recite essentially the same limitations as amended claim 1 and are also believed to be allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

All dependent claims are also believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/Michael J. Ferrazano/
Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 1687
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687
408-255-8001